83-786

No. _____

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1983

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF RICHARD S. SMALL TO THE STATE BAR OF NEVADA

ON APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

GERALD F. NEAL
2770 So. Maryland Pkwy
Suite 500
Las Vegas, Nevada 89109
(702) 737-5333

Attorney of Record for Appellant:
Richard S. Small

CLB PUBLISHERS & LITHOGRAPHERS, INC. • (301) 933-5220

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether denials without explanation of Petitions for waivers of State Supreme Court rules excluding non-ABA law schools are violative of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments when other graduates of non-ABA schools including the Petitioners school are allowed such waivers.

2. Is an ambiguous State Supreme Court procedural process that excuses the Court from having to Answer in a valid case or controversy when the Court is also the Respondent a denial of due process.

3. Is a case ruling by a Federal District Court binding on the District State when the State fails to appeal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases:

Constitution and Statutes:

Miscellaneous:

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1983

No.

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF RICHARD S. SMALL TO THE STATE BAR OF NEVADA

ON APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

PARTIES TO PROCEEDINGS

This proceeding originated when the Appellants application for admission to the State Bar of Nevada was rejected without explanation pursuant to a form letter from the State Bar of Nevada dated April 1, 1983, (App. A).

The Appellant then filed a Petition for Waiver of Nevada Supreme Court Rule 51(3), entitled, *In The Matter of the Application of Richard S. Small To The State Bar of Nevada,* no. 14837, on May 9, 1983, in the Nevada Supreme Court, wherein the Nevada Supreme Court and all individual members of the Board of Examiners of the Nevada Bar, and Nevada Bar counsel were served.*

OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL REPORTS

The adjudication of the Appellants application for admission to the Nevada Bar dated April 1, 1983, was by form-letter (App. A).

The Appellant's Petition for Waiver dated May 9, 1983, was denied by Order Denying Petition, dated and entered June 15, 1983 (App. B).

The Appellant's Petition for Rehearing filed on July 5, 1983, was denied by Order Denying Rehearing received August 15, 1983 (App. C).

---

*Board of Examiners served; Samuel S. Lionel, Thomas D. Beatty, Booker T. Evans, Frank J. Fahrenkopf, David W. Hagen, Stephen D. Hartman, Thomas E. Lea, Keith L. Lee, Howard D. McGibben, Gary E. DiGrazia. Bar counsel served; Ann Bersi, Kathy Teague.

JURISDICTION

The letter to the Appellant rejecting his application for admission to the Nevada Bar was an adjudication within a judicial proceeding.* *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman,* ____ US ____, 75 LEd2d 206, 224, 103 SCt ____ (1983).

The Order denying the Appellant's Petition for Waiver, was a final judgment in a judicial proceeding of the highest state court in a true case or controversy. The validity of state statutes as being repugnant to the Federal Constitution on their face and as applied to the Appellant were considered and upheld as Constitutional by the Nevada Supreme Court.** Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 USC § 1257(2). *Cohen v. California,* 403 US 15, 18, 29 LEd2d 284, 91 SCt 1780 (1971); *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, supra; Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn,* 420 US 469, 476, 43 LEd2d 328, 95 SCt 1029 (1975).

A timely Petition for Rehearing, which again asserted to and advised the Respondents of their unconstitutional actions, was filed by the Appellant on July 5, 1983, and denied by Order Denying Rehearing, received August 15, 1983.

A Notice of Appeal to this Court was filed in the Nevada Supreme Court, on October 18, 1983.****

Due to the novelty of the issues herein, the jurisdiction of this Court could in the alternative be invoked under 28 USC § 1257(3).

---

*See Appendix "A".
**See Appendix "B".
***See Appendix "C".
****See Appendix "D".

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides, as pertinent:

> No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides, as pertinent:

> No person shall * * * be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law * * *

The pertinent portions of the challenged State statutes, Nevada Supreme Court Rules sections 51, 56, and 70, provisions of which are set forth in pertinent part in Appendix "E" herein.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I.

DENIAL OF EQUAL PROTECTION

This case involves a rare situation wherein the Nevada Supreme Court sitting as Judge and Respondent in the same case, have denied the Appellant's application for Bar admission and subsequent Petition for Waiver without explanation,

yet this same court has previously granted admission to applicants from the same law school and foreign law schools.[1]

The Appellant's Petition for Waiver and Petition for Rehearing appealed from herein, strongly and consistently asserted throughout, that such adjudication of Nevada Supreme Court Rule 51(3)[2] as applied to the Appellant was a clear unconstitutional denial of his Federal Constitutional rights to liberty, property, equal protection and due process. The Respondent Court upheld the constitutionality of these Federal claims which were drawn into question in a manner directly bearing upon the merits, when it stated in the Order Denying Petition, "(W)e have considered the various contentions and conclude that they are without merit."[3] *Raley v. Ohio*, 300 US 423, 436, 3 LEd2d 1344, 79 SCt 1257 (1959); *Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn, supra.*

The Respondent Courts only cited authority, *In re Nort*, 96 Nev. 85, 605 P2d 627 (1980), is a confusing and rambling case from which no Bar applicant could interpret the Courts guidelines for waivers of its ABA rule.[4] *Nort* apparently expresses that graduates of non-ABA law schools may only be granted a waiver of the Courts ABA rule when the Petitioners' law school is unaccredited due solely to a factor unrelated to the quality of the education offered. The *Nort* court further held that foreign law schools are unaccredited for a reason unrelated to the quality of education, because they are outside the ABA geographical jurisdiction.[5] The Appellant herein

---

[1]See Martindale-Hubble Law Directory, vol. IV, 1983, law school no. 1137, pp. 79-100, Nevada attorneys.

[2]See Appendix "E".

[3]See Appendix "B".

[4]See Appendix "E". SCR 51(3).

[5]It is odd that foreign law schools totally unknown and thousands of miles away, are somehow qualified sight unseen, yet the Appellant's

asserts that his law school is unaccredited for a reason no less equally unrelated to the quality of education offered.[6]

No matter what justification the Nevada Supreme Court wishes to assert,[7] the fact still remains that the Appellant must leave his lifetime home to practice his chosen profession elsewhere when other non-ABA graduates from the same law school and foreign law schools are permitted to practice in Nevada. Without an explanation as to this disparity and inconsistency of treatment as applied to the Appellant, a finding of a denial of equal protection is appropriate. *Louis v. Supreme Court of Nevada,* 490 F.Supp. 1174, 1183 (Nv 1980); *Brown v. Supreme Court of Nevada,* 476 F.Supp. 86, 89 (Nv 1979), reversed on other grounds, 623 F2d 605 (9th Cir. 1980); *Murphy v. Egan,* 498 F.Supp. 240, 244 (Penn. 1980). Nor is the Nevada Supreme Court free to avoid Federal constitutional issues on such inadequate state grounds. *Cardinale v. Louisiana,* 394 US 437, 439, 22 LEd2d 398, 89 SCt 1162 (1969).

---

school, Western State, San Diego, CA, one of the largest law schools in the country, with thousands of graduates practicing law, is not considered qualified. It should be noted that the Appellant offered in his Petition to pay for the investigation of Western State by the Nevada Bar.

[6]Western State is fully accredited by the State Bars in California, Montana, Georgia and Indiana, and approximately 32 other states with reciprocity. Although it is a proprietary school run for profit, there is to date no evidence which has "ruled out the possibility of such schools meeting" all ABA standards, and that ABA standards seem to be "enforced by the states without any serious attempt to validate them." American Bar Foundation, Research Journal, vol. 1978, summer, no. 3, p. 515, 540-541.

[7]Although not a Federal issue, it should be noted that the Appellant's law school was listed as an approved law school in "Inter Alia", the Nevada State Bar Journal, Volume 43, no. 3, December, 1978, the official publication of the Bar. The Appellant relied on this publication to his detriment.

II.

DENIAL OF PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS

As the denial letter did not advise the Appellant of any procedure for appeal (Appendix A), Appellant filed his Petition for Waiver pursuant to Nevada Supreme Court Rule (SCR) 70, which is entitled, "(A)pplicants not recommended for admission; Notice; Procedure for review."[8] SCR 70(4) provides that an answer to the Petition may be filed within twenty days.[9] After thirty-five days had elapsed and no answer in opposition, the Appellant filed a Motion for Judgment on June 13, 1983, under Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure 31(c).[10] The Nevada Bar counsel filed an opposition to this motion on the same day, claiming that the Appellant should have filed under SCR 56(1)(b), and that "no responsive pleading is required." Within a matter of hours, the Respondent Court entered its Order Denying Petition on June 15, 1983.[11] The Order totally ignored the Appellant's Motion for Judgment filed two days before, and further told the Appellant he had filed eight days late.[12]

The Appellant's Petition for Rehearing dated July 5, 1983, strongly reasserted that the Courts rules resulted in a denial of procedural due process. The Bar's Opposition to Petition for Rehearing asserted that the Appellant's claims were "ridicu-

[8]See Appendix "E".

[9]*id.*

[10]NRAP 31(c) provides that the failure of a Respondent to file a responding brief may be treated as a confession of error.

[11]See Appendix "B".

[12]Note that Nevada is a Notice pleading state, and was on notice that Appellant filed under SCR 70, yet stood silent for many weeks. Nor can the Respondents now assert untimeliness as a defense on appeal when they failed to assert this before the initial judgment.

lous" and that Petitions for Waiver "do not amount to adversary proceedings."

This Court held in *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, supra,* on March 23, 1983, which the Appellant cited in his Petition for Rehearing, that such petitions were clearly adversary judicial proceedings within a valid case or controversy.[13] Pursuant to *Feldman,* The Respondents are estopped to deny that the Appellant's Petition for Waiver does not have to be answered.

A careful reading of SCR 56(1)(b) and 70, reveals that SCR 56(1)(b) refers to applications not "completed" or "filed" and is ministerial in application and mentions at least twenty-five separate rules. In contrast, SCR 70 is obviously the appropriate rule for a Petition for Waiver.[14] The Respondent's interpretation of its own rules was erroneous, and an unconstitutional denial of procedural due process.

III.

FAILURE OF STATE TO APPEAL

The Appellant's Petition for Waiver and Rehearing both cited *Louis v. Supreme Court of Nevada, supra,* which stated, "(W)here waivers of a rule are not granted with consistency and no explanation is given for the disparity of treatment a finding of denial of equal protection may be appropriate." (*id.* at 1183). *Louis,* like the Appellant was also a non-ABA applicant, who was denied a Petition for Waiver without consistency or explanation.

---

[13]District of Columbia Court of Appeals, *supra,* at 220.

[14]See *Louis v. Supreme Court of Nevada, supra,* at 1178.

Appellant asserts that when the Nevada Supreme Court failed to appeal *Louis*, the holdings of the *Louis* case became controlling and binding upon the Nevada Supreme Court, as the *Louis* court expressly stated that the Nevada Supreme Court denied Federal equal protection by denying Petitions for Waivers of SCR 51(3) without consistency or explanation. *H.L. v. Matheson*, 450 US 398, 406, 67 LEd2d 388, 101 SCt 1164 (1981). *Matheson* held that a prior holding of the Utah Federal District Court which stated that a Utah state statute would be unconstitutional if "so applied" by the state to a certain class of citizens, would be controlling on the state since the state failed to appeal. (*id.* at 406). The Respondents by failing to appeal *Louis* are required to give the Appellant an explanation why he is not qualified, as the Appellant is facing the same denial of equal protection complained of in *Louis*. Otherwise the Respondents will be able to continue to deny the Appeallant and countless others equal protection.

THE QUESTION IS SUBSTANTIAL

This case represents an unparalleled situation in American Jurisprudence. In what other case can a man apply for a license, be rejected by a simple form letter, and if he feels he has been denied his Constitutional rights must seek review from this Court. Such an incredible obstacle to climb to begin one's chosen profession in the place of his birth, is in itself a question of paramount substantiality.

The Respondents have been warned that their arbitrary and inconsistent adjudication process for Petitions for Waiver are a denial of due process and equal protection by no less than

two Federal Courts in Nevada.[15] The Respondents have nonetheless upheld as Constitutional the denial of the Appellant's Petition in the exact same manner as previously held as constitutionally repugnant by the Federal District Courts in Nevada. In light of the fact that it is the Nevada Supreme Court itself that is the Respondent in this case, this Court should note probable jurisdiction.

1. Whenever a benefit or a right is statutorily granted by a state, its arbitrary denial or inequal availability violates the Fourteenth Amendment. *Griffin v. Illinois*, 351 US 12, 16-18, 100 LEd 891, 76 SCt 585 (1955). Nevada has granted non-ABA graduates waivers of its non-ABA rule, including graduates from Appellant's law school and foreign countries.[16] The Respondent Court has also arbitrarily denied similarily situated non-ABA graduates who petition for a waiver without explanation.[17]

The Respondents cannot avoid this Federal question by citing *In re Nort, supra.* Nor can they choose to ignore Federal Constitutional law as they have in this case. It is highly improbable that any Judge sitting as both Judge and Respondent, thereby wearing two hats, would hold that he denied a man his constitutional rights. There is a potential for a biased denial of constitutional rights in this situation.[18] The Appellant has simply been denied his constitutional rights by those who wish to regulate the number of attorneys in Nevada.[19]

[15]See *Louis v. Supreme Court of Nevada*, 490 F. Supp. 1174, 1183 (Nv 1980); and *Brown v. Supreme Ct. of Nevada*, 476 F. Supp. 86, 89 (Nv 1979), reversed on other grounds, 623 F2d 605 (9th Cir. 1980).

[16]See *In re Nort*, 96 Nev 85, 605 P2d 627 (1980).

[17]See ft. nt. 1.

[18]*Withrow v. Larkin*, 421 US 35, 47-52, 43 LEd2d 712, 95 SCt 1456 (1975).

[19]See *Hoover v. Ronwin*, 51 LW 3776 (5-16-83), No. 82-1474, 686 F2d 692 (1982), this Court has granted certiorari in this case for precisely the same reason.

2. The Nevada Supreme Court has fabricated a highly ambiguous procedural scheme to prevent litigation against the Court itself. Respondents' assertion that a Petition for Waiver is "not an adversary proceeding," is in direct contradiction to this Court's holding in *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, supra.*

Pursuant to the Nevada Supreme Court's interpretation of its own Rules, the Appellant did not have a meaningful opportunity to be heard.[20] Unless this Court reviews such unconstitutionally questionable rules of procedure, future Petitions for Waiver will be an "arid ritual of meaningless form."[21]

It is no coincidence that the Nevada Supreme Court implemented the rules cited as authority for the Appellant's denial shortly after the *Louis* decision. These rules which once again deny any meaningful opportunity to be heard allow the Respondent Court to avoid the constitutional problems created by their arbitrary denials of certain applicants.

---

[20] *Boddie v. Connecticut,* 401 US 371, 377, 28 LEd2d 113, 91 SCt 780 (1971).

[21] *Wright v. Georgia,* 373 US 284, 291, 10 LEd2d 349, 83 SCt 1240 (1963); *N.A.A.C.P. v. Alabama,* 357 US 449, 457, 2 LEd2d 1488, 78 SCt 1163 (1958).

CONCLUSION

Probable jurisdiction should be noted.*

Respectfully submitted,

GERALD F. NEAL, ESQ.
2770 South Maryland Pkwy.
Suite 500
Las Vegas, Nevada 89109
Attorney for Appellant:
Richard S. Small

*The Court may wish to consider a continuation until this Court hears *Hoover v. Ronwin*, 51 LW 3776 (5-16-83), No. 82-1474, a case concerning Bar antitrust.

APPENDIX A

STATE BAR OF NEVADA

Applicant's Name RICHARD S. SMALL
Date APRIL 1, 1983

Dear 1983 Bar Applicant:

Please be advised your application for admission to the State Bar of Nevada has been received and the following action is being taken:

A._____Application accepted for further investigation and review:
_____No further information required.
_____The following information must be received prior to final acceptance:

1._____Law School transcript.
2._____Current certificate(s) of good standing from state bar, Supreme Court or highest court of state where admitted. States of_____
3._____Other_____

B._____No further action will be taken until the following is received:

1._____Receipt of filing fee or additional payment in the amount of $_____.
2._____Receipt of properly signed and notarized application(s).
3._____Receipt of two completed fingerprint cards.
4._____Receipt of required photographs.
5._____Receipt of completed authorization and release forms.
6._____Receipt of answers to the following questions:
_____
7._____Other_____

C. XXX Application is rejected for failure to comply with the following Supreme Court Rules relating to admissions:

1._____SCR 51(2) relating to residency.
2. XXX SCR 51(3) relating to graduation for an A.B.A. accredited law school.
3._____Other_____

Applicants accepted for further processing will be notified regarding appearance before the appropriate Disciplinary Board.

Deposit of filing fee does not constitute application acceptance.

Stacy Kellison
Admissions

APPENDIX B

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF RICHARD S. SMALL, FOR ADMISSION TO THE STATE BAR OF NEVADA.

No. 14837

Petitioner.

ORDER DENYING PETITION

Richard Small has petitioned this court for a waiver of the accreditation requirement of SCR 51(3). We have considered the various contentions and conclude that they are without merit. See In re Nort, 96 Nev. 85, 605 P.2d 627 (1980). Furthermore, we note that the petition is untimely under SCR 56(1)(b). Accordingly, the petition is denied.[1]

It is so ORDERED.

/s/ Manoukian, C.J.

/s/ Springer, J.

/s/ Mowbray, J.

/s/ Steffen, J.

/s/ Gunderson, J.

---

[1]In light of our decision, Small's request for permission to take the 1983 bar examination pending resolution of his petition is rendered moot.

cc: Samuel S. Lionel, Chairman
Ann Bersi, Executive Director
Kathy Teague, Bar Counsel
Gerald F. Neal
Annette R. Quintana

APPENDIX C

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF RICHARD S. SMALL, FOR ADMISSION TO THE STATE BAR OF NEVADA.

No. 14837

Petitioner.

ORDER DENYING REHEARING

Rehearing denied. NRAP 40(c).

It is so ORDERED.

/s/ Manoukian, C.J.

/s/ Springer, J.

/s/ Mowbray, J.

/s/ Steffen, J.

/s/ Gunderson, J.

cc: Samuel S. Lionel, Chairman
Ann Bersi, Executive Director
Kathy Teague, Bar Counsel
Gerald F. Neal
Annette R. Quintana

APPENDIX D

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION	
OF RICHARD S. SMALL, FOR ADMISSION	CASE NO.
TO THE STATE BAR OF NEVADA.	14837

NOTICE OF APPEAL TO SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that RICHARD S. SMALL, the Appellant above named, hereby appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States from final Order denying Petition for Waiver of SCR 51(3), entered in this action on June 15, 1983, and from final Order denying Rehearing, entered in this action on August 11, 1983.

This appeal is taken pursuant to 28 USC § 1257(2).

GERALD F. NEAL, CHARTERED
BY: /s/ Gerald F. Neal
Attorney for Appellant
2770 S. Maryland Parkway, #500
Las Vegas, Nevada 89109

APPENDIX E

TEXT OF STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Rule 51. Qualifications of applicants for examination. An applicant for examination for a license to practice as an attorney and counselor at law in this state shall:

1. Have attained his majority.

2. Be, prior to March 1 of the year in which he wishes to be examined, a bona fide resident and domiciliary of the State of Nevada, and remain such until examined as required by SCR 65, so as to permit and facilitate the examination, investigations, interviews and hearings necessary to determine the applicant's morals, character, qualifications and fitness to practice law.

3. Have received a degree of bachelor of laws, or an equivalent law degree, from a law school approved by the committee on legal education and admissions to the bar of the American Bar Association, and shall present evidence of the same. Provided, however, an applicant may file a bar application and be examined in advance of having received the foregoing degree if the applicant has completed at the time of said bar examination all but the final semester or quarter in law school and furnishes a statement with his bar application from the dean of his law school to the effect that the dean reasonably believes the applicant will receive a law degree at the end of the law school semester or quarter in which the applicant is taking the bar examination, or earlier.

4. Demonstrate that he is of good moral character and that he is willing and able to abide by the high ethical standards required of attorneys and counselors at law.

5. Not have been refused admission to practice law, or have been disbarred from the practice of law, in any state or before any court or governmental agency of the United States on the ground of unfitness of character.

6. Not be subject to any mental or emotional disorder which would render him unfit to practice law.

[As amended; effective April 17, 1977.]

Rule 56. Number and disposition of applications; approval by board of bar examiners.

1. All applications for admission to practice law in Nevada shall be submitted in triplicate and filed with the executive secretary of the state bar pursuant to subsection 1 of Rule 52. Upon receipt thereof, the executive secretary shall transmit immediately one copy to the clerk of the supreme court. The remaining two copies shall be retained by the executive secretary for use in determining the applicant's qualifications for admission.

(a) The executive secretary of the state bar may, upon reviewing the application, determine that the application is not completed or filed in accordance with the requirements of SCR 51 through 55, and may, upon written notification to the prospective applicant, reject the application. Such notification shall include reference to the specific basis for the rejection.

(b) A prospective applicant whose application has been rejected pursuant to SCR 56(1)(a) may, within 30 days from the date of notification, file a verified petition for relief with the Supreme Court, which shall be accompanied by proof of service of a copy thereof upon the executive director of the state bar and the board of bar examiners. Such petition shall be accompanied by copies of all relevant documents. If the court is of the opinion that relief should not be granted, it may deny the petition. Otherwise, the court may enter an order fixing time within which an answer may be filed by the board of bar examiners. Should the court determine that the petitioner is entitled to relief, it may direct the board of bar examiners to process the application in accordance with SCR 57 to SCR 75.

2. No applicant for examination for a license to practice as an attorney and counselor at law in this state shall be eligible for examination until his application has been referred to the state bar and has received the written approval of the board of bar examiners.

3. Commencing with applications filed for the 1966 bar examination, the board of examiners, in its discretion, may permit or refuse to permit an applicant whose verified application complies with the requirements of Rule 52 to take the annual bar examination. If the board has not completed its investigation into the appellant's moral qualifications for admission. If the board of bar examiners has

refused to permit an applicant to take the annual bar examination because its investigation into the applicant's moral qualifications for admision is not completed at the time of the annual bar examination, and the applicant's moral qualifications subsequently receive final approval of the board, the applicant shall be permitted to take the annual bar examination next following such approval without submission of further fees or applications, except the board, in its discretion, may order further character reports, including fingerprint reports, on the applicant during the intervening period.

Nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the board from calling to the attention of the court before final admission matters occurring subsequent to the final approval by the board of matters discovered subsequent to final approval.

[As amended; effective October 17, 1980.]

Rule 70. Applicants not recommended for admission: Notice; procedure for review.

1. An applicant not recommended by the board of bar examiners shall be notified by the court, at the applicant's address given in his application, of the fact that the board of bar examiners has recommended that he be denied admission, and whether such recommendation is based upon a failure to pass the examination or upon the applicant's failure to qualify in any other particular.

2. Any applicant so notified may, within a period of 60 days from the date of such notice, file a verified petition for review with the court, which shall be accompanied by proof of service of a copy thereof upon the board of bar examiners.

3. Such petition shall show therein, as may be appropriate, that:

(a) Such applicant was prevented from passing through fraud, imposition or coercion by the board of bar examiners; and

(b) That the applicant meets the qualifications set forth in Rule 51.

4. The board of bar examiners or its representative may, within 20 days after such service upon it of the copy of the petition for review, or within such further time as the court may grant, serve upon the applicant and file in the court an answer. If any such answer is served and filed, the applicant may, within 15 days

thereafter, or within such further time as the court may grant, serve and file a reply thereto.

5. The burden shall then be upon the applicant to establish to the satisfaction of the court that the adverse recommendations of the board of bar examiners were based upon fraud, imposition or coercion and that the applicant fail to meet this burden of proof, the court shall refuse to disturb the adverse recommendations of the board of bar examiners.

[As amended; effective April 27, 1975.]